cide, the Nazis virtually wiped out this portion of the population. In all, the Nazis took an estimated 200,000 Lithuanian lives.

When the Soviet armies returned to expel the Nazis in 1944, some 60,000 fleeing Lithuanians were found in East Germany and deported to Siberia. In the years 1945 and 1946, an estimated 145,000 Lithuanians were deported from their homeland. Another 60,000 were sent away early in 1949, after the farm population had refused to cooperate in the collectivization of agriculture.

Add to these atrocities the thousands of freedom fighters who fought against impossible odds and the hundreds of Lithuanians who were executed by the Communists after mass trials. Then one begins to get some idea of the ends to which Stalin's forces were willing to go when they set out to destroy the resistance of a patriotic people.

This resistance has not been destroyed. The spirit, the faith of the Lithuanian people has not been broken. I am proud, Mr. President, to join in honoring these courageous people and I submit, for appropriate reference, my concurrent resolution to reaffirm our resolve to bring about the freedom of Lithuania and her sister states, Latvia and Estonia.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The concurrent resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 21) was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

Whereas the peoples of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania have been denied the right of self-determination since the occupation and incorporation of their nations into the Soviet Union by force in 1940; and

Whereas the United States has consistently refused to recognize the abrogation of the rights of these Baltic peoples, and continues to maintain diplomatic relations with the representatives of free Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania; and

Whereas it is the policy of the United States to uphold the right of peoples everywhere to determine their destinies through free participation in elected governments: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the President of the United States should determine and promote diplomatic and economic policies which will—

(a) encourage the withdrawal of Soviet forces from Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania;

(b) develop the independence of those nations from the Soviet Union; and

(c) bring about free elections in Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania in order that Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania may regain their places in the councils of free nations as sovereign states representative of the desires and responsive to the will of their peoples.

ACTION BY THE UNITED NATIONS ON THE BALTIC QUESTION

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, 47 years ago, on February 16, 1918, the Republic of Lithuania was declared a free and independent state. Unfortunately, however, that independence was destined to be short lived. For, only a little more than 20 years later, this proud people were again shackled by the bonds of oppression and then slavery, first by Nazi Germany and later by Soviet Russia.

By action of the Nazis and the Communists, freedom in Lithuania was destroyed. However, in no place in the world does the spirit of freedom burn more brightly. Throughout the more than 27 years of their most recent subjugation, these 3 million remarkable people still walk the streets of their cities and villages with the spark of hope still warming their hearts that efforts of their friends in the free world will make it possible for them to again walk as free men in their homeland.

I join with my colleagues today in reminding the free world that the Communists, public deplorers of colonialism, are indeed practicing the rankest and most oppressive kind of colonialism on the freedom-loving peoples of Lithuania and other Baltic States. I join in a warning that, in spite of public utterances to the contrary, some of the newly emerged nations of Africa could find themselves subjected to the same kind of oppression by their friends and champions from Soviet Russia.

At the same time, I share with my colleagues an ever-swelling pride in the friendship of a people who have not let even vicious enslavement break their spirit or their hope to once again experience the joys of complete freedom. And, today is an entirely appropriate time to share with the Lithuanian people the spark of hope that still remains, and to salute them for their faith, their courage and their adherence to the ideals they share with all free peoples.

I, therefore, submit a concurrent resolution and ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The concurrent resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 22) favoring certain action by the United Nations on the Baltic question, was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

Whereas the Communist regime did not come to power in Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia by legal or democratic processes; and

Whereas the Soviet Union took over Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia by force of arms; and

Whereas Lithuanians, Latvians, and Estonians desire, fight, and die for their national independence; and

Whereas the Government of the United States of America maintains diplomatic relations with the Governments of the free Baltic republics of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia and consistently has refused to recognize their seizure and forced "incorporation" into the Soviet Union; and

Whereas the select committee of the House of Representatives, created by H. Res. 346 of the Eighty-third Congress to investigate the incorporation of the Baltic States into the Soviet Union, found that the incorporation of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia was contrary to established principles of international law; and

Whereas the opinion of the free nations and the free people of the world is to eliminate any kind of colonialism and imperialism: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America request the President of the United States to bring the Baltic States question before the United Nations and ask the United Nations to request the Soviet Union to do the following:

(1) To withdraw all Soviet troops, secret police, agents, colonists, and all controls from Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia;

(2) To return to their homes all Baltic exiles and deportees from Siberia, prisons, and slave-labor camps in the Soviet Union; and be it further

Resolved, That the United Nations conduct free elections in Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia under its supervision and punish all Russian Communists who are guilty of crimes against the peoples of the Baltic States.

AMENDMENT OF CONSTITUTION RELATING TO SUCCESSION TO THE PRESIDENCY AND VICE-PRESIDENCY—AMENDMENTS

AMENDMENT NO. 31

Mr. TOWER submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 1) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to succession to the Presidency and Vice-Presidency and to cases where the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

AMENDMENT NO. 32

Mr. AIKEN (for Mr. COOPER) submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by Mr. COOPER, to Senate Joint Resolution 1, supra, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

AMENDMENT NO. 33

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I submit an amendment, in the nature of a substitute for the language of Senate Joint Resolution 1. I ask that the amendment be printed and lie on the table. I ask unanimous consent that a statement, prepared by me, relating to the amendment, be printed in the the amendment, be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be received, printed, and lie on the table; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendment (No. 33) was ordered to lie on the table.

The statement presented by Mr. DIRKSEN is as follows:

SUMMARY OF MY POSITION ON SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 1

(By Senator EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN)

There is no doubt that we must have a constitutional amendment to deal with the problems of presidential succession and inability. I am in complete agreement with the Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments and with the full Judiciary Committee that we should take favorable action on an amendment without delay.

I support the purpose of the amendment. My concern arises from some of the language of the amendment.

The Attorney General, in his testimony before the Senate subcommittee, found it necessary to make a large number of "assumptions" to resolve ambiguities in the language of Senate Joint Resolution 1. Last week before the Judiciary Committee of the House, he indicated that the resolution as reported to the Senate had not cured these important ambiguities.

What are these troublesome points? They relate to the mechanics of the determination

of the President's disability and the transfer of his powers and duties. Such details need not and should not be included in a constitutional amendment, just as the Constitution leaves the details of presidential succession for legislation instead of incorporating the details in the body of the Constitution. But if these details are to be included in the amendment they must be reworked to avoid the ambiguities. This will take time.

If these problems are not cured now, it will take another constitutional amendment to cure them. However, the proper way to cure these ambiguities is to omit the details which give rise to them. This way also permits the most expeditious action.

To that end, I shall offer a substitute amendment which not only has been espoused by the Attorney General but which has carried the endorsement of the American Bar Association, the Association of the Bar of the City of New York, and the New York State Bar Association. It has been sponsored in the past by Members of the Senate from both sides of the aisle, and supported by three past Attorneys General of the United States. It is simple and direct in language. It provides that the Vice President succeeds to the Office of President upon the death or resignation of the President and to his powers and duties when the President is under a disability and it provides the route by which the Congress can deal with the details of presidential inability just as the Constitution now empowers the Congress to deal with presidential succession.

USE OF PUBLIC WORKS TO COORDINATE EFFORT TO AID ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED AREAS—AMENDMENTS

AMENDMENTS NOS. 34 AND 35

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, if the war we wage against poverty in the United States is to be won decisively, it must have both short- and long-range objectives. I am very proud of the action of the Senate in giving prompt approval to the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965.

The Appalachian plan will bring economic stability to more than 15 million Americans in 11 States living in an area encompassing more than 165,000 square miles.

We have taken a decisive first step toward implementing the goals of the Great Society, but we must go further. The needs of Appalachia are neither peculiar nor unique to a single area. The new roads, the new power, the new industry planned for Appalachia would benefit Alaska or any area in which development or redevelopment are needed.

A region bypassed or neglected cannot contribute. Its inhabitants lose hope. Worse, they drain the economy into which they should and would be contributing—given the opportunity.

The farsighted chairman of the Senate Public Works Committee [Mr. McNAMARA], has introduced a bill, S. 812, which would authorize the President to establish regional commissions to aid in the economic development of areas which have suffered from a lack of economic growth.

America needs such legislation. Other regional commissions similar to the concept of Appalachia should be established.

The McNamara bill, cosponsored by 31 Senators, does not specify the commissions to be created. Nor should it.

An area which is depressed knows it. Any action program is best initiated at the local level. Under the provisions of the McNamara bill, each Commission would develop an action program within which it would recommend the development steps to be taken at the local, State, and Federal level.

The stated purpose of the Regional Development Act of 1965 is to provide for the use of public works and other economic programs in a coordinated effort to aid economically disadvantaged areas of the Nation. In the section devoted to findings and statement of purpose, the distinguished senior Senator from Michigan recognizes "the interdependence of the national economy with the economic vitality of local and regional sectors."

The purpose of S. 812, as stated, is the achievement of lasting improvement and enhancement of the domestic prosperity by establishment of stable and diversified local economics and improved local living conditions.

I support this purpose, for poverty knows no boundaries. It comes uninvited. It lives in too many homes. It is an unwelcomed and unwanted guest in the Great Society. The development of new commissions, as proposed in the McNamara bill, will enable us to get rid of this specter more quickly.

The bill calls for the authorization of an appropriation of $20 million. Of this total $15 million would be used to provide technical assistance to the commissions while the remaining $5 million would be allocated to local development districts within the regions for administrative expenses and program planning.

Mr. President, to facilitate the establishment of the proposed regions, I send to the desk two amendments to S. 812.

My first amendment to S. 812 makes it possible to establish a region within a single State or the portion of a single State. The language of section 3(a) without my amendment stipulates that the President must receive the request for the establishment of a region from the Governors of two or more contiguous States. This of course immediately precludes the establishment of regions in Alaska, Hawaii, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and the territories and possessions of the United States. My amendment also makes it possible for a single State to attack a poverty problem which may exist in an area not contiguous with another State; States whose borders touch Canada or one of the Great Lakes—States such as Washington, Montana, North Dakota, Minnesota, Wisconsin, Michigan, Ohio, New York, Vermont, New Hampshire, or Maine. This amendment also makes it possible for a single State whose border touches Mexico to the south to establish a region —State such a California, Arizona, New Mexico, and Texas.

Similarly, this amendment could apply to our great States whose borders touch the waters of the Pacific Ocean, the Atlantic Ocean or the Gulf of Mexico—Washington, Oregon, California, Texas, Louisiana, Mississippi, Alabama, Florida, Georgia, South Carolina, North Carolina, Virginia, Maryland, Delaware, New Jersey, New York, Connecticut, Rhode Island, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, and Maine.

I do not suggest that Florida, for example, suffers from a depressed economy along its seacoast, but should there be a region in need of help and that region not be contiguous to Alabama or Georgia, then this legislation should be applicable and my amendment will make this assistance available, if desired.

My first amendment reads:

(1) On page 3, line 2, beginning with "Upon" strike out all through "States" in line 5 and insert in lieu thereof: "Upon receiving a request from the Governor of any State, or the Governors of two or more contiguous States, for the establishment of a development region for the purposes of this Act within such State or States."

(2) On page 4, line 14, after "if only" insert "one or".

My second amendment to S. 812 defines the term "State" and specifies that, as used in S. 812, it includes the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and the territories and possessions of the United States:

On page 3, between lines 22 and 23, insert the following: "(b) As used in this Act the term 'State' includes the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and the territories and possessions of the United States."

This amendment to S. 812 also makes it clear that decisions by a regional commission may be made by the Federal cochairman and one State member when the region is contained within a single State.

As a member of the Public Works Committee, I will work for the inclusion of these amendments prior to the reporting of the bill. A Great Society can be strengthened immeasurably by the enactment this year of the Regional Development Act of 1965.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my amendments be printed and remain at the desk for 10 days so that Senators wishing to cosponsor them may have the opportunity.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendments will be received, printed, and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the amendments will be held at the desk, as requested by the Senator from Alaska.

The amendments (Nos. 34 and 35) were referred to the Committee on Public Works.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs be discharged from further consideration of S. 996, a bill relating to mine safety, and that it be referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare under whose jurisdiction it properly belongs.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR S. 1087 TO LIE ON THE DESK

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, on behalf of the junior Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER], I ask unanimous consent that S. 1087 be held at the desk for

nor all the way off it [as advocated by the newer generation of paper-money theorists]. The new setup created by Roosevelt was referred to, while it was still news, as a gold-reserve standard.

BANK NOTES COVERED

The way it worked was that a percentage of the domestic bank notes in circulation was, theoretically, covered by a gold reserve. At the same time, however, to head off any resumption of the depression run on the banks, this gold reserve was frozen into one officially controlled hoard; so that no U.S. citizens could legally own gold.

However short of a definitive solution this essay in opportunism may have been, it was a compromise which worked [if only because the crisis had about spent its force, and the economy was about to stagger to its feet]. We haven't been under pressure to think about monetary fundamentals since.

But now the dollar has taken over from the pound sterling as the world's No. 1 international currency. Even if the money we are advancing to stave off a devaluation for sterling should prove well spent, this trend is bound to continue. This means that it's high time we got on with the unfinished business left over from the bankruptcy and bank-run crisis of the 1930's.

NO GOOD FROZEN

Our domestic gold reserve isn't doing any good for the dollar, or for the booming economy of the free world, frozen as it is in the icebox legislated in the mid-1930's. It certainly plays no part in the passing of money for hamburgers or houses; our business runs on paper [whether it's checks or greenbacks]. In the modern structure of finance, the only function left for gold is international, as a basis for settlement between central banks.

As long as the dollar remains frozen in the obsolete domestic gold reserve legislated a generation ago, it won't be free for this use, which is demanded by the new international role of the dollar.

We have $12 billion of financial muscle that isn't being used, and isn't needed at home. But it is needed to support the world's work that the dollar is being called on to do. Mobilizing it to create a new international liquidity base may well free the boom from the danger of a money squeeze, and give it a new lease on life.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time for debate has expired. The bill having been read the third time the question is, Shall it pass? The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS], the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE], and the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] is absent because of illness.

I further announce that the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY], and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS], the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER], and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL] would each vote "yea."

Mr. DIRKSEN. I announce that the Senators from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER and Mr. MORTON], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. JORDAN], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] is absent on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER], and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON], would each vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], is paired with the Senator from Idaho [Mr. JORDAN]. If present and voting, the Senator from Kentucky would vote "yea" and the Senator from Idaho would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 74, nays 7, as follows:

[No. 22 Leg.]

YEAS—74

Aiken	Hill	Pastore
Bass	Holland	Pearson
Bayh	Hruska	Prouty
Bennett	Inouye	Proxmire
Boggs	Jackson	Randolph
Brewster	Javits	Ribicoff
Burdick	Lausche	Robertson
Byrd, Va.	Long, Mo.	Saltonstall
Byrd, W. Va.	Long, La.	Scott
Cannon	Magnuson	Simpson
Carlson	Mansfield	Smathers
Case	McCarthy	Smith
Curtis	McClellan	Sparkman
Dirksen	McGee	Stennis
Dodd	McGovern	Symington
Douglas	McIntyre	Talmadge
Ellender	McNamara	Thurmond
Fannin	Metcalf	Tower
Fong	Mondale	Tydings
Gore	Monroney	Williams, N.J.
Harris	Montoya	Williams, Del.
Hart	Morse	Yarborough
Hartke	Mundt	Young, N. Dak.
Hayden	Murphy	Young, Ohio
Hickenlooper	Nelson	

NAYS—7

Allott	Cotton	Eastland
Bartlett	Dominick	Gruening
Church		

NOT VOTING—19

Anderson	Jordan, N.C.	Moss
Bible	Jordan, Idaho	Muskie
Clark	Kennedy, Mass.	Neuberger
Cooper	Kennedy, N.Y.	Pell
Ervin	Kuchel	Russell
Fulbright	Miller	
Johnston	Morton	

So the bill (H.R. 3818) was passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

PRESIDENTIAL AND VICE PRESIDENTIAL SUCCESSION—PRESIDENTIAL DISABILITY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 62, Senate Joint Resolution 1.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate joint resolution will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A joint resolution (S.J. Res. 1) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to succession to the Presidency and Vice-Presidency and to cases where the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with amendments.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, a proposal such as Senate Joint Resolution 1 may not have been needed when the Founding Fathers drafted the Constitution. It may not have been needed in 1877, when the Nation foundered in confusion over the question of whether Samuel J. Tilden had a just claim on the Presidency. It may not have been needed during the 80 days when President Garfield lay helpless and dying from an assassin's bullet. And perhaps it was not needed during the trying 16 months in which President Wilson was virtually unable to perform the functions of his office.

But today, Mr. President, we are living in a nuclear age—an age filled with promise, but fraught with danger. This generation of American people and our generations yet unborn cannot afford, for the safety of this Nation and the world, to be even for a moment without a Chief Executive of sound mind and body.

Senate Joint Resolution 1, by providing a means by which we shall always have a Vice President, and by giving us a formula by which the Vice President may act as President in certain circumstances, would provide for the smooth transition of executive authority, even if this Nation should have to undergo the terrible tragedy of losing a President and Vice President within the same 4-year term of office.

For the better part of the 176 years since the Constitution was adopted, Congress has been unable to agree to a proposal which would fill vacancies in the office of Vice President and which would provide a formula for determining Presidential inability. Throughout this period, we have been conscious of the need for something to be done. Now we are on the threshold of doing it, for now we have a proposal that is the work of many men who have labored for many months.

They developed a consensus—each one participating in legislative give-and-

take, no one demanding pride of authorship. They developed a proposal which the Senate approved, in substance, by a vote of 65 to 0 in the 88th Congress. They developed a proposal to which 77 Senators have attached their names in this Congress. They developed a proposal which is reasonable, workable, and flexible. It does not pretend to meet all contingencies; but it is drawn with broad brush strokes, so as to enable future American leaders to deal with contingencies which we perhaps are unable to foresee.

Mr. President, I know that all Members of this body and the American people are deeply and seriously interested in this proposal.

I know that several 11th-hour proposals were submitted in the greatest of sincerity. Some have suggested that we not attempt to amend the Constitution, but simply pass a statute to deal with these grave problems. Yet the present Attorney General of the United States and the previous three Attorney Generals have all stated emphatically that a Constitutional amendment is required in order to solve these problems. All of us can well imagine how, at a time when the physical or mental ability of the President to perform his duties was in question, a simple statute, subjected to widespread and serious challenge, could well plunge the Nation into chaos. Even if there is the slightest question, Mr. President, it would be well for us to take no chances. It would be well for us to amend the Constitution—not in an effort to revise it, but in order to remedy an obvious defect.

Others have suggested that we make no effort to specify a formula under which the President could be declared unable to perform his duties. They suggest an amendment which would simply allow Congress to pass laws on Presidential inability. There are several weaknesses to this proposal. First, I remind my colleagues that in 1933, a constitutional amendment was ratified. This 20th amendment, among other things, authorized Congress to pass laws to provide for the contingency that both the President-elect and Vice-President-elect might not qualify for office. Thirty-two years have gone by, Mr. President; and not only has Congress not passed such a law, but none has been given serious consideration.

More important, Mr. President, is the danger inherent in such a blank-check approach to the problems with which we are dealing today. Imagine, if you will, what President Andrew Johnson's hostile Congress might have done with the blank-check authority to pass laws on how the President would be declared disabled. Even if the President had vetoed such a bill, a two-thirds vote to override the veto could have been mustered on the subterfuge that Congress was not trying to get rid of the President, but merely was trying to provide for the contingency that he might be disabled at some time in the future.

Senate Joint Resolution 1 provides amply for the protection of the President from would-be usurpers. Even if the Vice President and the President's own Cabinet should conspire to unseat the Chief Executive, the conspirators would still need to win over two-thirds of both houses of Congress.

The proposal before us leaves the decision on inability in the hands of the executive branch of Government. Only when the President, on the one hand, and the Vice President, with the support of a majority of the Cabinet, on the other, disputed the President's ability to perform, would Congress come into the picture, to settle the question. The blank-check approach could well open the door to clear infringement by the legislative branch on the prerogatives of the executive branch.

We must jealously guard our traditional separation of powers, for it has given this Nation checks and balances so effective as to enable it always to move forward, but with reason and moderation.

Finally, Mr. President, the blank-check approach, I am afraid, would meet with great disfavor among the several States that must ratify our action before it can become a part of the bedrock law of our land. In our form of government, certain rights are reserved to the States. I firmly believe that our States would object, and properly so, to any constitutional amendment which would hand over to Congress the right to change the law any time it chose, on a matter as grave as that of who is to lead our Nation in this perilous period. The States will demand, and properly so, constitutional language that makes clear the path which must be followed if there is a vacancy in the office of Vice President and if a President is temporarily struck down by severe illness or—and we must frankly face this terrible prospect—by the bullet of a would-be assassin.

We have traveled a long road toward the realization of a proposal such as the one before us. We are close to seeing it enacted. Let us not now shrink from meeting our responsibility.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM AND ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 11 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I should like to query the distinguished majority leader about the program for tomorrow, the possibility of any voting, and the prospect of Senate Joint Resolution 1 going over until next week, if necessary, because of the intervention of Washington's Birthday on Monday.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, first, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business this evening, it stand in adjournment until 11 a.m. tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. In response to the question raised by the distinguished minority leader, the leadership hopes, with the Senate concurring, that the Senate joint resolution will be disposed of tomorrow. If it is not, it will have to go over. I understand that at least two, possibly three, amendments will be offered to the joint resolution. I do not know how much time consideration of those amendments will take, but that is the best I can say at the moment. There has been a unanimous-consent agreement in relation to referral of a bill. In addition, some nominations will be considered.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART] is present in the Chamber. I should like to inquire of him how long he will take to discuss the referral proposal.

Mr. HART. I anticipate that I shall need only a very few minutes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Then there will be only limited discussion on our part. We might be able to dispose of that question in 30 minutes.

Mr. HART. I am sure that that is possible.

OPPOSITION TO PROPOSED CUTS IN SCS TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM AND LEGISLATION TO FINANCE COSTS BY A USER CHARGE

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point the letter which I addressed on February 17 to the Honorable JAMES O. EASTLAND, chairman, Subcommittee on Soil Conservation and Forestry, Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, discussing my opposition to any reductions in appropriation of Federal funds for the technical assistance program provided by the U.S. Department of Agriculture Soil Conservation Service, and stating opposition, also, to the enactment of any legislation to finance part of the cost of this Service by a user charge. The enactment of such legislation was included in the recommendations submitted in the fiscal year 1966 Presidential budget.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEBRUARY 17, 1965.

Hon. JAMES O. EASTLAND,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Soil Conservation and Forestry, Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR EASTLAND: Included in the recommendations submitted in the President's budget for fiscal year 1966, under the Soil Conservation Service program providing technical assistance to aid farmers in installing conservation practices on their farms, is the enactment of legislation to finance part of the cost of certain of these services by a user charge, with collections of $20 million estimated for 1966.

If the authorizing legislation is passed by the Congress, and if congressional committees, and subsequently the Congress, act to support this budgetary proposal, this will reduce Federal funds for SCS technical assistance by $20 million for 1966 with similar reductions to follow in fiscal years thereafter.

I wish to state my opposition to this recommended reduction in soil conservation funds and to express my belief that the savings to the Federal Government are totally disproportionate as compared to the damage to the country which will result from the emasculation of this valuable technical assistance program.

If a user charge system is inaugurated, I believe that needed improvements to land will be halted; that permanent land treatment practices will not be maintained; that the gradual slowing of demand for technical

of calculated anti-U.S. demonstrations for propaganda purposes; that until such evidence is forthcoming, all talks on trade and credits between U.S. corporations and Russia will be discouraged; that should there be a recurrence of any demonstration involving damage to U.S. property, all cultural exchange agreements between the United States and the U.S.S.R. will be be canceled.

The first Kremlin reaction to U.S. firmness along the above lines would no doubt be shock. But the Soviets being realists, the shock would be followed by acquiescence. They need U.S. trade far more than they need excuses for propaganda demonstrations. The cultural threat would alarm them at least as much as the economic one. Russians have always been exceedingly sensitive to the charge "nye-kulturny"—"Not cultured." No criticism from abroad cuts deeper into the pretensions of Soviet propaganda.

U.S. firmness last November would not only have made last Tuesday's Moscow riot unlikely, it would have developed in all Iron Curtain countries a new caution in the face of temptations to stage anti-U.S. demonstrations. It would have made American citizens feel that their Government had adopted more realistic policies in response to Soviet political warfare.

MORE ON FALLOUT

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, as I have repeatedly told the Senate, the contamination caused by radioactive fallout in the Arctic is a prolonged, increasing, and serious problem. It is a problem about which very little is being done.

The Federal Government has a responsibility to the people of Alaska—and, indeed, to all the people of the United States—to see that adequate surveillance and monitoring and adequate research into effects and countermeasures are undertaken. What is Alaska's problem today could—with resumption of atomic testing—be the problem of all America tomorrow.

The staggering increase in Arctic contamination levels creates an emergency situation which should be met with an emergency response. We must do more and spend more on research on the contamination of the Arctic food chain. Mr. President, I am hopeful that the administration will recognize the extent of the emergency and the need for immediate action.

I ask unanimous consent that an editorial from the Washington Post of February 14 be made a part of the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Feb. 14, 1965]

MORE ON FALLOUT

Disclosure in the authoritative journal Science that radioactive fallout in the bodies of northern Alaska Eskimos has doubled in the last 2 years is an alarming piece of information. This discovery of the increased amounts of cesium 137 is disquieting for its effect on the Eskimo (even though authorities think the amount would have to be five times as great to be a menace) and it is disturbing as a forecast of what might happen in the event of heavy radioactive fallout from renewed testing or from actual atomic war.

And this is so because the increase was not anticipated and is expected now to continue into the future. Cesium 137 emits radiation to the whole body and particularly to fat and muscle. Science miscalculated the effects of early testing in two ways. The fallout was expected to diminish more quickly and the food chain effect was not fully anticipated. This latter phenomenon promises to make the health hazards of any fallout protracted.

The northern lichens collect the fallout and the caribou eat the lichens and the Eskimos eat the radioactive caribou meat. How long might such a cycle last in the event of thermonuclear war? It is horrifying to think of how persistent this sort of radiation might be in the event of heavy and protracted fallout. The farther we part the veil of ignorance that has limited our knowledge of this phenomenon the more appalling the prospect appears.

SENATOR BAYH'S AMENDMENT: A SOUND SOLUTION TO A DIFFICULT PROBLEM

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, as a cosponsor of Senate Joint Resolution 1, I rise to pay a brief tribute to its author, the junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH].

Following the tragic event of November 22, 1963, many Senators introduced proposals for constitutional amendments to provide a procedure for filling vacancies in the office of the Vice President. Others of us joined as cosponsors of these proposals. The need was clear.

We were fortunate in having as the chairman of the Constitutional Amendments Subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH], though he had served in the Chamber less than a year. His subcommittee was charged with the difficult and well nigh impossible task of studying all of these proposals, and arriving at one that would be workable in operation and acceptable, not only to Congress, but also to the State legislatures.

The result of this study, Senate Joint Resolution 139, was reported to the Senate in August 1964, after extensive and scholarly hearings before the distinguished membership of the Judiciary Committee. The joint resolution was passed shortly thereafter by a vote of 65 to 0; but it arrived in the House of Representatives too late for full consideration there last year. It was reintroduced this year, in somewhat altered form, as Senate Joint Resolution 1, was reconsidered by the Constitutional Amendments Subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee, and thereafter was reported from the full committee.

The proposed amendment handles a variety of circumstances for which no adequate answers presently exist. Under its terms, should the President die or resign, the Vice President, upon becoming President must nominate a new Vice President, who would take office upon confirmation by a majority vote of both Houses of Congress. Likewise, should the Vice President die or resign, the President must nominate a new Vice President, again subject to confirmation by Congress. Should the President declare in writing that he is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office, this measure provides that the Vice President would serve as Acting President.

As for the more delicate situation in which a President would be incapable of determining his own inability, the proposed amendment provides that, should the Vice President and a majority of the heads of the executive departments, or such other body as Congress might provide, determine that the President was unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office, the Vice President would become Acting President upon transmitting to Congress a notice of his intention. It further provides that the powers and duties of the office of President would revert to the President upon his transmitting to Congress his written declaration that no inability exists. However, this declaration could be controverted by a written declaration by the Vice President, directed to Congress, and concurred in by a majority of the heads of the executive departments or such other body as Congress might provide. When this occurred, Congress must immediately determine the issue. If the determination of inability by the Acting President and departmental heads was concurred in by two-thirds of both Houses, the Acting President would continue to discharge the powers and duties of the President. Otherwise, the President would resume his office.

I would not be surprised, Mr. President, to see the Senate pass Senate Joint Resolution 1 by an even larger vote, this time. We can, perhaps, count on the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH] to have seen to that. If the other body will give its speedy attention to this worthy piece of proposed legislation, we shall see it ratified by the requisite number of States by the end of next year.

I thank the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH] for his efforts on behalf of Senate Joint Resolution 1. He has done an astounding thing: In his first term, he has studied one of the most delicate and most troubling problems of our day, and has found for it, here in the Senate, a well nigh unanimously supported solution.

SENATE SABBATICALS

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, a few days ago, in a short address to this body, I indicated that I was submitting to the senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] a proposal for senatorial sabbaticals, and that his committee might wish to consider when it deliberates on the questions and proposals for congressional organization and reforms of the rules.

As I indicated, this proposal has engendered mixed reactions—both favorable and unfavorable.

I am particularly grateful today, however, to find an excellent editorial on the subject in the February 12, 1965, edition of the Casper, Wyo., Tribune. The points raised in the editorial are thought-provoking; and I think my colleagues will find it of interest. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Casper (Wyo.) Tribune, Feb. 12, 1965]

SENATE SABBATICAL

We are not sure that we fully understand Senator GALE MCGEE's proposal for senatorial sabbaticals, but we are not ready to write the suggestion off as impractical.

The Senator recommends that a leave of absence be granted every 6-year term for a period of 3 to 6 months "to assess the world and our place in it—time to read and reflect." He would have political fence-mending prohibited during the sabbatical.

Perhaps it is his professorial background which leads Dr. MCGEE to make this recommendation. He has, both before and during his career as a Senator, made considerable study of other countries. Because of his temperament and approach to national problems—and we hope not to get too personal in this—it can be assumed that he would benefit from such a schedule. Whether other Senators would similarly benefit, is a matter of conjecture.

Any Member of the Senate taking advantage of the opportunity would have to hie away to some retreat where he could not be reached by persons pressing for particular legislation or by newsmen seeking his views on current issues. If he is to read and reflect, he may have to do it incognito. Would Senator MCGEE's proposal include trips to other countries? Such trips, unless the expenses were borne personally, would raise the cry of "junket."

Members of the Senate and House do have recesses, although sessions are sometimes prolonged and frequently there is committee work even when Congress is not convened. Would the average Member be willing to absent himself for a period when he knows that some rival contender may be making political hay back home? Could he in any practical sense absent himself at a time of critical decisions, particularly those which might affect his own State?

These are questions which arise in weighing the Senator's proposal, which also triggers certain other observations.

Unless the situation changes, Americans will have more leisure time on their hands. How they are to enjoy this leisure will be a determining factor in whether it is to be beneficial or deleterious. Members of the U.S. Senate well might set an example for the country.

How necessary are these long sessions, lengthy hearings, almost interminable debates? It is one of Parkinson's laws that the time taken to accomplish a given task will be expanded to fill the time allowed for it. The right of Congress to deliberate ought not to be abrogated, but it is apparent that much legislation would be just as good with less argument. The Wyoming Legislature meets for 40 days every 2 years, generally stopping the clock on the last day of the session. Congress cannot be expected to set such a short time limit. It should, however, adopt a reasonable schedule, and no President should have the power to keep it in session through much of a long, hot summer just to get his program across. Only in case of emergency should this be permitted.

Perhaps if Members of the House and Senate would set realistic but definite deadlines, they would find plenty of opportunity to read and reflect. Nobody expects them to work all the time.

NEED FOR PROTECTION FROM ELECTRONIC EAVESDROPPING IS GROWING, TO PROTECT THE INDIVIDUAL'S RIGHT OF PRIVACY

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, although I do not believe it would be correct to say that people nowadays are any snoopier or any nosier than people have ever been, nevertheless those with an itch to find out what their neighbors are doing or saying or thinking certainly are now better equipped to practice their hobby than they have ever been before. A proliferation of electronic wiretapping and eavesdropping devices has flooded the market in recent years. Anyone who has the money can buy "spike mikes," matchbox "mikes," sugar lump "mikes," picture frame "mikes," devices that will pick up an ordinary conversation from 500 feet away, room probes, telephone monitors, and other listening devices that would be the perfect answer to a busybody's prayer.

The fourth amendment guarantees an individual's right to be secure in his person, house, papers, and effects against unreasonable searches and seizures. The time is fast arriving when the spirit of the fourth amendment will have to be applied to new forms of invasion of personal privacy.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Big Brother's Ears Are Getting Littler—But They're Hearing More as Peeping and Eavesdropping Business Booms, Even in the Federal Government." The article was published on February 14, 1965, in the Washington Post.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post of Feb. 14, 1965]

BIG BROTHER'S EARS ARE GETTING LITTLER BUT THEY'RE HEARING MORE AS PEEPING AND EAVESDROPPING BUSINESS BOOMS, EVEN IN THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

(By Ramon Geremia)

"Just think of the convenience of this one," said the last line of the magazine advertisment.

Above it was a drawing of a man with a sly, devilish look on his face. He was holding something called a telephone monitor to his ear.

"Hear two-way conversations without picking up receiver," said the ad for this 'new, private listening device,' that 'weighs only 1½ ounces.'"

According to the ad, more and more of the electronic devices designed for military use are being made available for civilians. This ingenious (just ½-inch thick) unit is one, and ingenious it is. Just lay it against a telephone, put the plug in your ear, and you can hear and record a 2-way conversation, clearly without touching or picking up the receiver.

"Pretty sly little gadget," says one version of the ad, "it fits in your pocket without a bulge."

And with just $18.95 and a Diners Club card you can be the first in your neighborhood to have one.

That was in the January, 1964, edition of the Diners Club Magazine.

This is only one of the many, many clever little gadgets you can use to become your own private ear. You too can eavesdrop electronically on your friends and neighbors.

These devices are easy to come by, so easy, in fact, that two congressional subcommittees are conducting inquiries into violations of privacy by the unrestricted sale of electronic snooping devices.

Federal law on invasion of privacy is almost nonexistent and those State laws which exist are frequently vague and antiquated.

Congress passed a law in 1934 providing stiff penalties for wiretapping, but wiretapping is practiced with impunity and virtual immunity from Federal prosecution.

One reason is that the Government is hesitant about bringing attention to some of the devices it uses.

Most Government agencies, however, have a written policy which prohibits recording, transcribing, monitoring or listening in on phone calls without advance notification and approval.

The same holds true for the purchase, rent, leasing or borrowing of electronic or mechanical devices.

But the General Services Administration lists a host of such devices in its catalog, and they are available to Government agencies which ostensibly do not allow them. One advertised GSA item is a "telephone adaptor for monitoring phone calls without a beep."

The congressional committees concerned with the proliferation of snooping devices are the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee on administrative practices, headed by Senator EDWARD V. LONG, Democrat, of Missouri, and the special House Government Operations Subcommittee. LONG's committee will open invasion of privacy hearings next Thursday.

Bernard Fensterwald, counsel for the Senate subcommittee, said that last fall a detailed 6-page questionnaire concerning invasion of privacy was sent to 34 Government agencies.

He said returns so far indicate that phone monitoring, peepholes, hidden recorders, and miniature transmitters are the primary snooping practices used in the Government.

Fensterwald said the subcommittee has not so far concerned itself with the snooping devices used by the Government's security agencies such as the FBI, CIA and the military.

A major concern of the committees is those devices which are available not only to Government agencies but also to the public at large.

For one thing, Federal Communications Commission regulations prohibit recording any telephone conversation without using a beeping device.

And further, the telephone directory has a paragraph which says that if you hear a short "beep" tone about every 15 seconds the conversation is being recorded.

"This signal is provided by the Telephone Co. for your protection," says the phone book. "Use of a recorder without recorder-connector equipment containing a tone-warning device is contrary to the company's tariffs and not permitted."

The devices generally available to the public frequently are not so sophisticated as the expensive, intricate superprofessional investigator kits which run into thousands of dollars, but they will do.

But even the highly sophisticated gear is available to anyone who has the money.

The less expensive versions of the more sophisticated gear include:

An international-police room probe that sets into wall—sees all according to advertisements. This item gives 172-degree-wide vision, is only as round as your finger, tucks into your pocket easily, is one-half inch across, telescopes out from 1 to 5 inches and costs $3.95. This "little optical gem," according to its maker, is made in Spain for use in Interpol, the international police organization.

The international audio-wall probe which you just place against any wall, and it will pick up sounds, voices in the next room, according to its ads. "This solid state space-age device has just been made available to the public from missile research and development," says the blurb. It weighs only 6 ounces and with it you can detect the faintest of voices and sounds in the next room—good for knowing what the kids are doing without their realizing it.